

Joseph E. Patten P E
3728 Siskiyou St.
Redding, Ca. 96001
(530) 243-2619

Mr. Lester Snow
CALFED Bay-Delta Program
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA. 95814

Nov. 17, 1998

Dear Lester:

I read with considerable interest the recent news article covering support of the Peripheral Canal by the National Heritage Institute in San Francisco . Ever since the joint agencies (CDF&G, DWR, USBR, USCE, and USF&W) Task Force chaired by the Chief of Engineering for the Sacramento District Corps of Engineers, Joe Gomez, reported favorably on the P.C. in 1965, there has never been a more maligned, more thoroughly studied, and more misunderstood project in California. The biggest guns against it originated in Contra Costa County when the county mobilized vigorous opposition to the State Water Project during the 1960's. From then on the media, some legislators, (my own assemblyman got on TV and called the P.C. the "rape of the north" and a "pipeline to the south") made it a *pinata*, the destructors of which where not blindfolded. This is where the emotions took over and philosophical views came out of the woodwork.

Before the election on Prop 200 in 1982, I prepared a series of slides for Clair Hill describing the hydrodynamics of the delta and the estuary showing the then current conditions (reverse flows) and the proposed conditions with the P.C. in place. He used the presentation several times and I presented it on a panel at ACWA with Dave Kennedy and again in Red Bluff on a panel that included Congressman Bizz Johnson and the supervisor from Contra Costa County, Sonne McPeak. I can assure you that the presentations between the supervisor and me was a "no contest".

When I was consultant to the State Senate Water Committee in the 1970's I sat in on a hearing on the P.C. at the Capitol. Congressman Jerry Waldie from Contra Costa County was the first witness, out of respect for the ranking Politician present. There were about 6 TV cameras in the hearing room and as soon as the Congressman finished they all folded their tripods and left. That was a productive hearing ? In many ways you are facing the same problems. Citing these experiences may not be telling you anything that you don't already know. But I reflect on these because I think that the *facts are facts* and your technically competent engineers and scientists have to find a convincing way of presentation to attain your so-called consensus on a factual basis. For all I've seen of the BDAC and the agency regulators doing your planning the consensus scale tilts too far from good science to arrive at logical conclusions.

The same frustrations over the P.C. and in my view the malignment are now apparent in the regulators holding storage hostage to the Ecosystem Restoration. In my opinion, the

restoration cannot be realized without new water, or many of the existing viable economies will continue to suffer.

I see that even Mark Reisner is beginning to see the light starting with the aggressive programs initiated several years ago by the California Rice Industry Association. Proper and persistent factual data will eventually overcome the emotions and philosophical views if there is any logic left in this society. Your people could work harder and more selectively to convince a few of the more logical thinking environmental organizations to support the obviously needed actions. And as I have said before, time is of the essence since we are in a state of serious water deficiencies *now*. And aside from the time requirements for permitting, the construction and filling time for new storage can be 20 years or more. Meanwhile California's local and statewide economies, including some of the environmental concerns continue to suffer.

To supplement these comments, I have enclosed a copy of a memo in response to a discussion I had some time ago with Ron Ott. He had asked me to put some of my views on paper.

Sincerely,



Joseph E. Patten